CONTOS & BUNCH 1 LAWYERS 5855 TOPANGA CANYON BOULEVARD 2 SUITE 400 WOODLAND HILLS, CALIFORNIA 91367 (213) 716.9400 3 4 5 Attorneys for Defendant, GERALD ARMSTRONG 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY OF CASE NO: C 420 153 CALIFORNIA, FIRST AMENDED ANSWER Plaintiff, TO COMPLAINT (PROPOSED) VS. GERALD ARMSTRONG, Defendant. MARY SUE HUBBARD,

Intervenor.

COMES NOW defendant, GERALD ARMSTRONG, for himself and for no other defendant, admits, denies and alleges as follows:

1.

ANSWER TO GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- (1)Defendant admits paragraph 1.
- (2) Defendant denies that there are or should be any other individuals named as defendants in said action.
- (3) Defendant admits that he was a member of the Church of Scientology and a member of the Sea Organization from February 1971 until December 1980, but denies that the Sea

Organization is a "fraternal organization" or that members of the Sea Organization take "special vows of confidentiality". Defendant states that members of the Church of Scientology in general are often coerced into signing various legal documents, the contents of which they either do not know or are informed that the documents are just "for the government" and that members need not be concerned about them. Defendant states that the "non-disclosure and release bond" commonly utilized by the plaintiff was considered to be unenforceable as a legal document and contrary to public policy. Defendant states that the non-disclosure and release bonds are generally used to conceal criminal and tortious acts, conduct, policies, and "operations" of the plaintiff which are designed to perpetrate such acts.

- (4) Defendant denies that he was a staff member of the plaintiff and denies the remaining allegations of par. 4. Defendant's position and membership in the Church of Scientology is more specifically set forth in the Cross-Complaint made a part hereof.
- (5) Defendant denies that the plaintiff is a notfor-profit corporation, admits that it is organized under the
 laws of the state of California, denies that it is a religious
 organization and admits that it has a principal place of business
 in Los Angeles, California.
- (6) Defendant admits that he was responsible and appointed by L. Ron Hubbard to a project involving the collection and maintenance of information and materials about Hubbard and his commencement of Scientology. Defendants denies that

that Scientology is a religion, but rather claims that it 1 2 is a criminal conspiracy fraudulently started by Hubbard 3 that has engaged in a continuous pattern of criminal, fraudulent and tortious operations, practices and policies 4 5 since its inception right up to the present date. Defendant 6 denies that he was an agent of the plaintiff but rather as a party to a contract with Hubbard. Defendant states 7 that Hubbard had absolute control of all plaintiff's accounts, 9 that plaintiff acted as the agent of Hubbard and that any and 10 all of his activities were not conducted for the plaintiff 11 but rather for Hubbard. Defendant denies that any and all materials collected or maintained by him in said project are 12 13 the personal property of plaintiff, but rather states that said 14 materials constitute his property or the property of Omar V. 15 Defendant further states that the materials and 16 documents collected by him in said project in many respects 17 reveal a consistent pattern of fraud perpetrated by Hubbard 18 through his agent, the plaintiff, upon members of the Church 19 of Scientology and the public at large. Defendant asserts that 20 the membership of the Church of Scientology and the general 21 public have an interest in said materials and documents in 22 order to reveal the falsity of numerous representations uni-23 formly made in writing by Hubbard and the plaintiff. 24

(7) Defendant admits that the purpose of gathering and collecting the materials in his contract with Hubbard was for the purpose of providing those materials to.

Omar V. Garrison to write a biography of Hubbard. Defendant asserts that when he learned the contents of

25

26

27

28

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

.17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

numerous materi s they realized that Hub ad's background, qualifications, credentials and claims as represented by him and the plaintiff as his agent in writing have been uniformly misrepresented and constitute a fraud on the public at large which is purchasing plaintiff's publications and also upon Church membership.

II.

ANSWER TO FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- Defendant repeats and repleads each and every answer contained in answer 1 through 7 above and incorporates the same herein as though fully set forth herein.
- (9) Defendant denies the allegations in par. 9 and claims that any materials in his possession were and are properly in his possession and constitutes the property of him or Omar Garrison, but that the plaintiff is "a public figure" and that the information contained in any materials and documents in his possession should be properly known to the public.
- Defendant denies that the property recited in (10)the Complaint has any value apart from the value of the information contained in the documents. Defendant states that the value of the information contained in the documents is incalculable because if said information was made known to the public at large and/or the membership of the Church of Scientology it would uniformly refute almost all of the claims made about Hubbard, his background, qualifications, credentials and purposes in beginning the Church of Scientology.

- (12) Defendant denies that plaintiff has made any proper written demand for said documents or materials, on the grounds that said materials and documents do not belong to the plaintiff but rather to the defendant and/or Omar Garrison. Defendant also denies that there was any wrongful taking and conversion of any property by defendant.
- (13) Defendant denies that there has been any conversion of any property or that any property in his possession belongs to the plaintiff and therefore denies that the plaintiff has incurred any damage in connection with any effort to regain said property.
- (14) Defendant denies that any of his acts were intentional, deliberate, willful, wanton, malicious, oppressive, or were committed with intent to defraud plaintiff or in disregard of the rights of the plaintiff. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to recover any damages, but rather asserts that he is entitled to recover damages as more fully set forth in his Cross-Complaint filed herewith.

26 ////

27 ////

28 ////

K-31

111.

2

3

5

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

21

25

26

27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- Defendant repeats and repleads each and every answer contained in paragraphs 1 through 7 above and incorporates them herein as though fully set forth herein.
- Defendant denies that he became a fiduciary to the plaintiff regarding any materials or documents under his custody or control or that he assumed any legal duty to the plaintiff except a legal duty in contract with Hubbard to write his biography with Garrison with whom defendant had an agreement as research assistant to provide documents and other relevant materials for the biography project.
- Defendant denies that there is any conflict of interest between him and the plaintiff and/or the Ralston Pilot Publishing Company in violation of any fiduciary duty.
- Defendant denies the enforceability or validity of Exhibit B to the Complaint. Defendant states that the nondisclosure and confidentiality bonds referred to are in violation of public policy, constitute a fraud on the general public and Church membership, and have been adjudicated to be unenforceable in the case of Church of Scientology v. La Venda Van Schaick, et al Clark County, Nevada, Civil No. A196800. Defendant further states that any and all information contained in the documents and materials which he collected on behalf of Hubbard for Omar V. Garrison contain information about a "public figure", do not constitute trade secrets, reveal evidence of a sustained pattern of criminal fraud and misrepresentation, and that it is

in violation of ablic policy to coerce the execution of non-disclosure and confidentiality bonds in said circumstances. Defendant denies that he has intentionally and without legal excuse breached any duty of confidentiality.

- disclosure of any confidential information, or that he has caused injury to any reputation or diminution in value of any materials. Defendant asserts that the referenced biography of Hubbard cannot be written with the uniform misrepresentations and fraudulent policies and practices exercised by the plaintiff because the information contained in the documents which he collected reveal said misrepresentation and fraud. Defendant further alleges that the truth of the matter contained in said materials is a defense to any claims for damages based upon defamation. Defendant further states that public policy forbids the concealment of the information contained in said documents and materials and encourages the dissemination and disclosure of said information.
- any demand to cease unauthorized disclosures of confidential information, or that the information is confidential or that he can be prevented from making said disclosures in the form of affidavits to appropriate courts for the purpose of criminal and civil litigation.
- (21) Defendant denies that any unauthorized disclosures of confidential information have caused any damages to the plaintiff, or that the plaintiff has standing to assert any such damages, or that an authorized biography of Hubbard can

be written by the plaintiff which is not false and fraudulent, unless the plaintiff admits the truth of the information contained in the documents and materials which he collected.

(22) Defendant denies that any of his acts were intentional, deliberate, willful, wanton, malicious or oppressive and committed with intent to defraud the plaintiff or in reckless disregard of plaintiff's rights and denies that plaintiff is entitled to any damages, but rather claims damages as set forth in the Cross-Complaint herein.

IV.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

- (23) Defendant repeats and repleads each and every answer contained in paragraphs 1 through 7 and 15 through 22 above and incorporates them by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- perty of the plaintiff in breach of any fiduciary duty or that he will be unjustly enriched at plaintiff's expense. Defendant denies that a constructive trust should be impressed upon said property or that he should be named as trustee on behalf of the plaintiff. Defendant claims that any attempt to prevent the disclosure of any of the information in said documents and materials will be a prior restraint on freedom of speech and expression in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Defendant further states that any information in said documents is information about a public figure and said information should be made available to the general

public and to the membership of the Church of Scientology.

IV.

ANSWER TO REQUEST FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- (25) Defendant repeats and repleads each and every answer contained in paragraphs 1 through 7 and 15 through 22 above and incorporates them herein as though fully set forth herein.
- (26) Defendant admits that there is a controversy between plaintiff and defendant because plaintiff has brought the subject action. Defendant denies the subject action was properly brought but that it is merely intended to be harassive and vexatious, and defendant denies that he owes any duty of fiduciary or other nature to the plaintiff.
- of the respective rights and duties of the parties must now be made because the suit has been harassively and vexatiously brought by the plaintiff, but defendant denies that he owes any duties and obligations to the plaintiff but rather the plaintiff is responsible for fraudulent misrepresentation and other torts more fully set forth in the Cross-Complaint filed herewith. Defendant denies that a constructive trust should be imposed upon said property.
- (28) Defendant admits that a judicial declaration is now necessary in the subject action.
- (29) Defendant denies that this Court should preliminarily or permanently enjoin the defendant from unauthorized dissemination of any information contained in said documents

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

lô

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

on the grounds that the information is not confidential, that it is in violation of public policy to conceal it, that plaintiff has no standing in which to bring the subject action, and that information, unless it is in the form of a trade secret, is not protected under the law.

VII.

ANSWER TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Defendant answers as follows to the plaintiff's prayers:

- (1)Defendant denies that general and special damages as to the first cause of action should be awarded to the plaintiff.
- Defendant denies that the Court should order the (2)return of any property to the plaintiff based on the first cause of action.
- Defendant denies that general and special damages should be accorded to the plaintiff on the second cause of action.
- Defendant denies that this Court should issue either a temporary restraining order or a preliminary or permanent injunction prohibiting him from disseminating any information about the plaintiff, and that any such order would be in violation of his right to freedom of speech and expression under the United States Constitution, Amendment 1.
- Defendant denies that punitive and exemplary damages in the amount of \$50,000.00 should be awarded per cause of action.
 - Defendant denies that a constructive trust should (6)

be impressed upon any property in the possession of the defendant.

- (7) Defendant denies that any materials in the project referred to can be disseminated, copied or made available to the public only with the express authorization of the Church of Scientology of California.
- (8) Defendant denies that reasonable attorneys' fees or costs should be awarded in such action, except as set forth in defendant's Cross-Complaint.

VIII.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- (1) And further answer the Complaint/Complaint-inIntervention, defendant states that plaintiff and intervenor
 should be barred from seeking equitable relief by way of injunction in that plaintiff and intervenor come before this Court
 with unclean hands. Plaintiff and intervenor seek by way of
 injunction to suppress/destroy evidence of frauds in that the
 documents and materials presently under seal in this case
 evidence numerous frauds regarding the alleged background and
 accomplishments of L. Ron Hubbard, founder of Dianetics and
 Scientology, frauds which have been perpetrated upon defendant
 and thousands of Scientology followers and the public.
- (2) And further answering the Complaint/Complaint-inIntervention, defendant states that plaintiff and intervenor
 should be barred from seeking equitable relief or any recovery
 herein in that plaintiff and intervenor were involved in the
 destruction by shredding of documents, which documents defendant

saved from destruction and preserved. Defendant fears that should the documents and materials presently under seal be returned to plaintiff and/or intervenor pusuant to injunction, that spoliation would again result. Said documents and materials are highly relevant evidence to defendant's Cross-Complaint in this case and all the Scientology litigation.

- (3) And further answering the Complaint, defendant states that the plaintiff's action is barred by the doctrine of laches. Hubbard has been in possession of most of the information contained in the documents for the past 30 years. The documents and materials collected have been in the possession of Omar Garrison for a period covering at least from 1980 to early 1982. Plaintiff's failure to prohibit the dissemination of the documents and information to Carrison, a third party, not a member of the plaintiff Church, bars any and all equitable relief to prevent the dissemination of documents to other third parties or to recover damages for said dissemination.
- (4) And further answering, defendant states that the plaintiff does not have standing to bring the present action. The documents and materials only have value in so far as they contain information about L. Ron Hubbard, a public figure. The information contained in said documents could only be barred from dissemination if it constituted trade secrets, was defamatory, or violated a right of privacy of L. Ron Hubbard. Since Hubbard has not asserted any claim to said materials on the violation of either his rights of privacy, or the unlawful dissemination of trade secrets or defamatory information, plaintiff has no standing to assert said claim on his behalf.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

(5) And further answering, defendant states that plaintiff cannot be entitled to damages or injunctive relief as a matter of law unless the documents and materials collected by defendant and the information contained therein have been disseminated in violation of rights of privacy of L. Ron Hubbard, constitute false and defamatory statements, or constitute trade secrets.

(6) And further answering, defendant states that it is against public policy and in violation of defendant's rights under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution to prevent him from disclosing or disseminating the information contained in the subject documents and materials, or the documents and materials themselves.

WHEREFORE, defendant prays that plaintiff take nothing and that defendant be given judgment against plaintiff for his costs incurred herein and for such other and further relief as may seem just and proper.

DATED: March 16, 1984.

CONTOS & BUNCH

By: ///// DRAGOJEVIC

Attorneys for Defendant

GERALD ARMSTRONG